APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/010,591	11/09/2001	Manfred Bartz	CYPR-CD01163M	4354

45545 7590 07/15/2005	EXAMINER
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP	VU, THANH T

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO, LLP
TWO NORTH MARKET STREET
THIRD FLOOR
SAN JOSE, CA 95113

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2174	

DATE MAILED: 07/15/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

PTO-90C (Rev. 10/03)

	Application No.	Applicant(s)
Office Action Summary	10/010,591	BARTZ ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Thanh T. Vu	2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE <u>3</u> MONTH(S) FROM
THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.
- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed
  after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
  Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
  earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *22 April 2004*.
2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**.　　2b)☒ This action is non-final.
3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
　　closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are pending in the application.
　　4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6)☒ Claim(s) *1-37* is/are rejected.
7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.
　　Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
　　Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
　　a)☐ All　b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:
　　　1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
　　　2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
　　　3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage
　　　　　application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
　　* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)
1)☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2)☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3)☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____.
4)☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
　　Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
5)☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6)☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

This communication is responsive to the amendment, filed 04/22/2005.

Claims 1-37 are pending in this application. In the amendment, claims 1, 11, 21, and 31

were amended.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
> section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are
> such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person
> having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the
> manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-4, 7-14, 17-24, 27-33, and 35-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being

unpatentable over Microsoft Word ("MS") and Choy et al. ("Choy", U.S. Pat. No. 5,506,952).

As per claim 1, MS teaches a method of helping a user perform tasks in software, said

method comprising: rendering a first plurality of graphic elements (fig. 2 *elements 10 20*) and a

second plurality of graphic elements (fig. 2; *elements on row 40*), wherein said first and second

pluralities of elements are visibly displayed regardless of which of said tasks is being performed

(fig 2), and regardless of whether said first and second pluralities of graphic elements are active

or inactive, wherein user selection of an element with said element is active initiates an action in

response to said selection while a user selection of said element with said element inactive does

not initiate an action (fig. 2; *selection of elements 10 and 20 initiates an action; selection of*

elements on row 40 does not initiate an action).

making a first portion of said first plurality of graphic elements active (fig 2; *elements 10*

and 20 are active), and making a second portion of said second plurality of graphic elements

active in response to user selection of an element from said first plurality of graphic elements (*selection of an element 10 of fig. 2 make elements on row 40 active, see fig. 3*),

MS does not teach said tasks are to be performed in a logical order and wherein said second portion is selectively activated to guide said user through said tasks according to said logical order. However, Choy teaches aid tasks are to be performed in a logical order and wherein said second portion is selectively activated to guide said user through said tasks according to said logical order (*fig. 3; logical order 40; col. 5, lines 14-33; col. 6, lines 49-67*). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention to include inactive icons as taught by Choy in the invention of MS in order to prevent user from selecting an incorrect icon to perform an operation.

As per claim 2, MS teaches wherein said first plurality of graphic elements comprises elements that are active regardless of which task is being performed (*fig. 2; elements 10 and 20*).

As per claim 3, Choy teaches wherein elements in said first portion are selectively activated to guide said user through said tasks according to said logical order (*fig. 3; logical order 40; col. 5, lines 14-33; col. 6, lines 49-67*).

As per claim 4, MS teaches wherein elements in said second portion are activated in response to user selection of an element from said first portion (*selection of elements 10 and 20 of fig. 2 make elements on row 40 active, see fig. 3*).

As per claim 7, MS and Choy discloses said first and second plurality of graphic elements comprises first icons organized in a first row and said second plurality of graphic elements comprises icons organized in a second row adjacent to said first row (MS; *figs. 2; first row 30 and second row 40)*, wherein said first icons and said second icons are arranged to indicate a

hierarchy of said tasks within said logical order (*fig. 3; logical order 40; col. 5, lines 14-33; col. 6, lines 49-67*) .

As per claim 8, Choy teaches wherein said first and second plurality of graphic elements are displayed in an order corresponding to said logical order (*fig. 3; logical order 40; col. 5, lines 14-33; col. 6, lines 49-67*).

As per claim 9, MS teaches wherein selected windows are displayed in response to user selection of an element (*fig. 3; window 50*).

As per claim 10, MS and Choy teaches wherein a first element for a first task and a second element for a second task are active at the same time, wherein according to said logical order there are intervening tasks between said first and second tasks, and wherein movement between said first task and said second task is accomplished without movement through said intervening tasks in response to user selection of said first and second elements (*MS, fig. 2 and 3; Choy, fig. 3; logical order 40; col. 5, lines 14-33; col. 6, lines 49-67*).

Claims 11-14 and 21-24 are similar in scope to claims 1-4, respectively, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 17-20 and 27-30 are similar in scope to claims 7-10, respectively, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 31-33 are similar in scope to claims 1-3, respectively, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 35-37 are similar in scope to claims 7-9, respectively, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claims 5-6, 15-16, 25-26, and 35 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Microsoft Word ("MS", Choy et al. ("Choy", U.S. Pat. No. 5,506,952), and Applicant's Admitted Prior Art ("AAPA").

As per claims 5-6, while MS and Choy teaches the method of helping a user perform tasks in software, MS and Choy does not specifically teach wherein said tasks comprise tasks for designing a microcontroller and wherein said microcontroller is designed according to a programmable single-chip architecture. "AAPA" discloses the use of tasks in designing a microcontroller and wherein said microcontroller is designed according to programmable single-chip architecture. (page 2, lines 6-20; page 4, lines 1-5). It would have been obvious to an artisan at the time of the invention to combine the teaching of Bartz from "AAPA" with the method of MS and Choy because it simplifies and facilitates microcontroller design by making the process more intuitive and easier to use by representing tasks as graphical elements.

Claims 15-16 and 25-26 are similar in scope to claims 5-6, respectively, and therefore are rejected under similar rationale.

Claim 35 is similar in scope to claim 6, and therefore is rejected under similar rationale.

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments with respect to the amendment have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Inquiries

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Thanh T. Vu whose telephone number is (571) 272-4073. The examiner can normally be reached on Mon-Thur and every other Fri 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's

supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on (571) 272-4063. The fax phone number for

the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent

Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications

may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished

applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR

system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR

system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

T. Vu

Kristine Kincaid
KRISTINE KINCAID
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100